

REMARKS

The Final Office action of May 20, 2011, has been carefully considered.

Non-elected claims 98-101 have been canceled without prejudice to filing one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected subject matter.

Claim 95 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Jacobson in view of Luke; claim 96 stands rejected as obvious under 35 USC 103(a) over Jacobson in view of Luke and Townsend; and claim 97 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Jacobson in view of Luke and Lingafelt et al.

Claim 95 has now been amended to recite that violation of the default security rules by unwarranted intrusion results in blocking of the activities of said computerized system and protection of the user against the unwarranted intrusion.

As now defined, the encrypted database is operatively connected with the operating system of the computerized device, and acts in conjunction with the monitoring and capturing subsystem to allow the subsystem to block activities in violation of the default rules contained in the database.

The Jacobson reference is directed to an electronic record management system, and not to a system which protects the user against unwarranted intrusions and activities.

According to the Jacobson reference, it is the e-mail records

themselves that are encrypted, and not a set of default security rules. Moreover, the purpose of Jacobson is to ensure user compliance with a set of security rules, and not to protect the user against unwarranted intrusion in violation of security rules.

The Luke reference has been cited to show monitoring of excessive hard drive activities, but does not otherwise cure the defects of the Jacobson reference.

Townsend and Lingafelt et al. have been cited to show aspects of the invention recited in Claims 96 and 97, respectively, but also do not cure the defects of the Jacobson and Luke references.

Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Applicants hereby petition the Commissioner for Patents to extend the time for reply to the Final Office action dated May 20, 2011, for one month from August 20, 2011, to September 20, 2011. A duly completed credit card authorization form is attached to effect payment of the extension fee.

Respectfully submitted



Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 24

Date: September 20, 2011